



## TRAFFIC SAFETY AND PARKING COMMITTEE MINUTES

Wednesday, October 7, 2009 - 7:00 pm

San Bruno City Hall  
567 El Camino Real  
San Bruno, CA 94066

## MINUTES

### 1. ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS -

#### A. ROLL CALL

<u>TSPC Members:</u>	<u>Present</u>	<u>Absent</u>
(Chair) Mark Howard	X	
Eric Wood (Vice-Chair)	X	
Tom Hamilton	X	
Doris Maez		X
Sol Weiner	X	

#### Staff in Attendance:

Steve Davis, Public Works Department  
Matt Campi, Police Department

Public in Attendance Total: 3

### 2. REVIEW OF AGENDA

Agenda approved as submitted.

### 3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Approval of the August 5, 2009 meeting minutes made by Tom Hamilton, second by Eric Wood. (M/Hamilton, S/Wood: 4-0-0) Approved.

### 4. PUBLIC COMMENT ON ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA

Harry Orange, 3120 Sneath Lane, stated his concerns about speeding on Sneath. He stated his next door neighbor was involved in a six-car accident when a vehicle traveling too fast hit numerous parked cars. There have been four accidents in two years involving speeding just on his section of street. The speed limit is 35 miles per hour on Sneath, which is too high. Traffic has increased due to additional schools in the area and the Marisol development.

Mark Howard responded that speed limits are set by the law, which takes into consideration the width of the street and engineering studies of speeds that vehicles are driving, then they take the 85% percentile average speed that vehicles travel on a street and the number is set by that.

Harry Orange said someone had recommended speed bumps to slow people down instead of a stop sign. He would like to see City staff research installing speed bumps on Sneath.

Mark Howard stated a review by staff of traffic calming measures on Sneath can be discussed and added to a future meeting, but no action can be taken at the current meeting because it is not listed on the agenda.

Matt Campi commented that he would notify patrol officers of the speed concerns.

## **5. REGULAR BUSINESS**

### **A. Consideration of New Time Limited Parking Restrictions in Vicinity of Belle Air Elementary School**

Steve Davis stated that in the past there have been attempts to improve traffic calming at Belle Air School, including the City's addition of speed humps on Third Avenue and the creation of a new route for traffic in proximity to the school. Most of the work was implemented at the beginning of this school year, and last year the Committee approved time limited parking and new curb markings for quicker pick up and drop off of children. There are currently eighteen parking spaces in the center of the roadway in front of Belle Air School. The School's suggestion is to limit these parking spaces to 15 minutes in the morning from 7:30 am to 8:30 am and in the afternoon from 2:30 to 3:30, with the balance of the day to be six hour parking. This time limit would be consistent with the other parking in the lot adjacent to Belle Air Field. Staff believes this would provide for short term parking demands. Residents were noticed along Third Avenue for this meeting.

Tom Hamilton asked if the Police Department would be able to enforce the restrictions. Mark Howard responded that an officer would have to be posted there. Commander Campi said this would be challenging. Community Service Officers have issued tickets and made their presence known in the past and if there was a problem, police would definitely respond.

Steve Davis stated Public Works staff was at Belle Air School at the beginning of the school year to assist in directing traffic. Staff also observed long term parking usage and abated some vehicles before school started to help make the beginning of the school year run smoother. Steve recommended that both Police and Public Works staff be present at the beginning of school each year to create a visible presence to reinforce the parking and circulation requirements.

Tom Hamilton stated the extra enforcement and advance work alleviates his concerns. Commander Campi stated the Police Department is committed to making a known presence with patrols both at the beginning of the school year at Belle Air and the other San Bruno schools, as well as throughout the rest of the school year.

Mark Howard said there were previously some missing signs at the bus drop off area, but instead of replacing them, all the signage was removed. Steve Davis responded that the previous signs contained a lot of text, so the City has replaced them with dual timed parking signs for 15 minutes on the west side with the 2 hour parking time listed beneath it and the no parking pick up and drop off signs with the 2 hour parking time limit signs beneath those. Staff has remarked the whole area and added new channel lanes. The staff observation the first week of school was that there was a big improvement. School staff has also been out helping with traffic each morning as well.

Mark Howard asked about the Lions Field driveway. Steve responded it has been reconstructed into a normal driveway.

Steve stated along 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue staff is intending to install additional sidewalk. Mark Howard asked if the Armory continues to block their lot to outside parking. Steve confirmed there is a gate up.

Sol Weiner asked if the school has ever discussed issuing a letter to parents to discuss this item. They could just pass them out. The parents are the ones that need to be informed. Steve said that is a great suggestion and school Principal Claire Beltrami has already done that this year.

Commander Campi stated earlier in the year he and Steve met with the Principal at John Muir School and the same type of program of notifying parents was in effect and had good results.

Mark Howard stated the signage should state 2 hour parking between 8:30am and 6 pm instead of 8 am. Steve Davis stated the 15-minute time limited parking will be valid Monday through Friday and the six-hour parking will be valid Monday through Saturday. On Sunday there is no limit. Mark Howard asked why Saturday is included in the time-limited parking. Steve responded that the City's Municipal Code requires parking limits to include all days except Sundays and Holidays.

Tom Hamilton stated many parents want to do the right thing by minding traffic rules, but if spaces are being used by vehicles parked for long periods, it makes it difficult.

Mark Howard made a motion to accept the staff recommendation as noted and forward this item to the City Council for review. Second by Eric Wood. (M/Howard, S/Wood): 4-0-0 - Approved.

B. Establishment of Goals and Criteria for Evaluating Parking Restrictions: Red Curb/No Parking Zone, Yellow Curb/Loading Zone, Blue Curb/Disabled Parking, Green Curb/20-Minute Parking Zone, Restricted Tall Vehicle Parking Zone, Auto Repair District/12-Hour Parking Zone – Continued from August 2009 Meeting

Steve Davis stated DKS Consultants has provided traffic engineering support with this issue. Mark Spencer from DKS presented the item. City staff has worked with DKS to bring together a good consensus of the data gathered from other cities.

Mark Spencer stated that DKS staff performed parking studies and research on policies from other cities that are similar in size, as well as larger cities. Staff has developed draft forms of the policies for the Committee's discussion.

Blue curb/handicap parking zone: This is typically a resident request that most cities deal with on a case-by-case basis. This is generally not policy driven. This is for non-commercial land use. The first area reviewed should be the on site parking availability, including on street parking congestion. The requesting party must possess a handicap parking placard and have a documented need. It must also be explained to the requesting resident that this will become available to any vehicle that has a handicap parking placard. There must also be consensus from abutting property owners and tenants. The requesting party would also be responsible for the cost, including maintenance, staff time and signage on a two-year interval. This would be the policy.

Procedurally, the requesting resident would come to City staff or the Committee to request the parking restriction. Staff would have to perform an analysis to see if a parking shortage exists, surveying abutting owners and then making the recommendation to the Committee, which would then go before the City Council for action. Each of the parking restrictions reviewed will follow in this vein procedurally. In respect to commercial stores, such as a medical store, that shows a documented need for handicap parking, the procedure would be the same in that staff would assess parking and the feedback of the neighboring businesses. This would apply to businesses that have a clientele with a possibly high need for handicap parking; the business itself would not be required to have a handicap placard.

Time Limited Parking – establishment or change in a new or existing zone: These requests are usually strictly for commercial use parking. The study process is still utilized and staff must consider the

associated impacts in changes of the parking time limits or in the decision to eliminate parking altogether.

Eric Wood stated the wording should not automatically make the business owner responsible for the parking restriction change. This request may be something the City changed in the past and needs to correct. Mark Howard suggested changing the wording to say, "evaluating whether the requestor is the party responsible for fees" or "requestor may be partially responsible for fees incurred" based on whether or not the change is beneficial to a single entity or the community at large.

Mark Spencer stated that if the request came from a single entity, then the City would have to decide if they would cover that cost. Eric Wood asked how the fees are established. Mark Howard responded that the fee recommendation would be established by the staff and then forwarded to the TSPC, which would then forward their recommendations to the City Council.

Steve Davis stated the fee charges should be a policy decision, as past traffic calming work has been charged to general City resources and have not been charged to the public. Steve asked what the Committee's feedback is, but it is ultimately the Council's decision.

Sol Weiner stated the City Council will review any item that involves a cost factor. Whoever makes the parking request has to understand they may need to pay for it. Mark Howard concurred and said a cost policy should be recommended.

Mark Spencer stated the Committee should look at items that are not covered under the City's Vehicle Code. Safety should trump everything else, so there should be a documented safety policy.

Mark Spencer said green and yellow curb requests are for commercial areas and red curb requests should be analyzed for their purpose. The City should not install 100 feet of red curb if they can use signage to create a "no stopping" zone. The City's vehicle code is clear about the distinction between "no stopping" or "no parking" red zones. Red curb installation should be used on a limited basis, at approximately 25 feet maximum. To be justified, there should also be high traffic volume, an issue of speed, or an accident history that would warrant a red curb. Eric Wood asked if the speed should be higher than 25 mph to qualify for red curbing. Steve Davis responded that the speed ideally should be higher than that.

Eric Wood responded that we have installed red curbing in low speed zones in the past. Should the Committee look at establishing a policy for red curbing for lower speed zones? Steve Davis responded he would rather create one policy. Eric Wood responded that while we are creating these new policies, we should include this.

Commander Campi stated we could create a policy of no red curb in speed zones of 25 mph or lower.

Mark Howard asked what the appeal process would be for residents? Steve Davis responded that staff would first review the appeal, and then it would go before the City Council. Mark Howard responded that it seems like it would be a smoother process if the appeals came to the TSPC instead of going directly to the City Council.

Tom Hamilton stated he thought appeals were going to go through the TSPC. The new policy should weed out most of the requests, but an appeal should be handled like the Committee handles them now.

Eric Wood stated perhaps if someone submits an appeal, they should have to pay for the City staff's time to review the appeal. Mark Howard stated it could be charged as an application fee to offset the

costs. The application should also ask them to get all their supporting documents in order. The application should also have a time limit to be placed on the TSPC agenda.

Mark Spencer concurred that the process of being sent directly to the Council could also be very intimidating. A generic appeals process makes sense.

Eric Wood does not think there should be a fee for an application if the resident does not even know if their request is going to be approved or not. If it does not meet the criteria of the policy, they should not be charged.

Matt Campi commented that a second tier fee schedule could be established when the application is approved. When the application is received, if it is clear that the request will not be considered, then it can be handled at that time. If there is a question on the validity of the request, then at that time a fee would be assessed. The Police Department needs a mechanism to tell people no to requests in a polite, organized manner.

Mark Howard stated the decision then needs to be who to charge, how much and at what time during the application process. Mark Spencer agreed that there needs to be a process, but it needs to be consistent with the City's other policies, such as tree removal.

Steve Davis responded that at this time, the initial investigation is usually performed as a courtesy. Mark Howard stated when the Police Department has to tow your car, there is a fee to the tow truck company and a fee to the Police Department. It is not a large fee, but it does help offset the expense.

Mark Spencer agreed that an established fee schedule would make sure the resident is serious about the issue. The City of San Mateo went through this process and they now have a good fee template. Mark Howard asked what the fees are in San Mateo. Mark Spencer responded that the fees range from \$139 to \$169 per request, which is a flat fee.

Eric Wood would like the application fee to be free and then a fee can be imposed if it goes beyond that to the procedural side.

Tom Hamilton asked how San Mateo proceeds after receiving the application. Mark Spencer responded that they would review the application and let the requestor know staff has made a determination and go from there. At that time, if the resident wants their request implemented, they must pay the fees.

Eric Wood asked if the requests go before the City Council in San Mateo. Mark Spencer responded that they do not; staff handles the requests directly based on the policy. Mark Spencer also presented a copy of the application forms from the City of San Mateo to the Committee for review.

Sol Weiner stated the policy should be worded to avoid residents trying to go over the Committee's head, because San Bruno residents will fight any policy that involves money. Steve Davis stated the City should have the ability for full cost recovery for the services we provide for these requests. Making the resident pay for the fee up front and then refunding or reducing the fees if it is deemed necessary is a reasonable approach.

Eric Wood asked if all requests are going to go through the City Council. Steve Davis responded he would like to review the levels of approval of some of the other agencies.

Mark Howard asked if a template for the application has been developed. Mark Spencer responded that the City of San Mateo will hand out the application with the policy that relates to their request. If the resident decides to submit the application, it must include a check.

Mark Howard stated the application and policy should be handed out to each person, whether or not the staff person feels their request is covered under the policy so each resident feels they have been given a chance to apply.

Matt Campi responded that the policy is going to be put in place to let people know what will be considered and what won't. Letting the resident know right away is the best approach so they know there is no point in moving any further with an application and fees. Tom Hamilton agreed that residents should be made aware of the policy right away.

Mark Howard responded that if the only way to challenge the policy is to go to Council, the Council will be very busy. Eric Wood responded that the TSPC should be the first appeal process. Steve Davis agreed. A response in writing would direct them to come to the TSPC for an appeal.

Matt Campi stated this would avoid the staff analysis time because the resident would have to justify his appeal to the TSPC before any staff work is done.

Mark Howard commented that the drawback is not having both sides of the story behind the request – having the resident's history of the problem as well as the City staff's feedback. Eric Wood responded that the TSPC could direct staff to perform an analysis of the request after the resident has paid the necessary fees.

Eric Wood stated the City staff should be allowed to make the determination based on the policy.

Sol Weiner asked if Commander Campi has any statistics on the number of residents that have made requests that have been denied. Commander Campi responded he does not have those numbers, but generally most residents, when told of the City's policy denying their request, thank us and it ends there.

Mark Spencer stated the best approach would be to share the policy with residents and then if they want to appeal the policy, go from there. Having residents pay the money and proceeding with the analysis without the appeal process is a waste of valuable staff time. The appeal process is an important step.

Steve Davis stated he would like to take the comments from this meeting and condense it into a form we can review at the next meeting. Mark Spencer wanted to review the material with the Committee before a final form is developed.

Restricted Tall Vehicle Parking Zone: Mark Spencer stated that regarding parking large vehicles on the street, the City's current policy does not allow vehicles to be parked for over 72 hours on any public street. When you begin getting involved with RV's or other large vehicles, is it a safety issue or simply something that is unsightly for the neighborhood. Some communities do have limitations on parking RV's or boat trailers on the street, but it is usually a hot issue.

Auto Repair District/12-Hour Parking Zone: Mark Spencer noted the same statement applies to auto repair shops that have a number of cars moving in and out of their garage. There is already the 72 hour parking time limit, so is it an actual safety issue or just an unsightly inconvenience? The policy should avoid any limitations that will invite challenges to it.

Mark Spencer stated the existing commercial vehicle code requires commercial vehicles to park along designated truck routes, as well as the 72-hour time limit.

Sol Weiner stated he would like to see a City policy that takes the existing City policies and integrates them with the new policies being created so everything is covered.

Steve Davis stated he wanted to address the issue of red curbing adjacent to driveways, as this has gone before the City Council and was ruled that these requests would not be considered. The City Council has deemed that if a resident wants to have better access to their driveway, they can apply for a permit and widen their driveway.

Steve Davis stated large vehicles that are creating an obstruction hazard are not considered a parking policy issue and will be dealt with under current policy when evaluating site distance and safety. Matt Campi also stated there are ordinances that address the length and width of a vehicle on a public street.

Tom Hamilton recommended including current City ordinances in the policy so that they can be easily referenced to the public. Matt Campi stated that the current ordinances are well known, such as vehicles parking on the sidewalk.

Mark Howard asked what the next step should be. Steve responded that he would come back at the next meeting with a draft of the application and fee schedule.

Mark Howard stated it might be a good to get some cost estimates for installation of the requested items, such as a white zone or a red zone, with the size of the zone covered with that cost.

Eric Wood stated we should not give residents the option as to whether they are willing to pay for their request, but make it mandatory, as well as the future maintenance fees associated.

Mark Spencer stated there are some requests that are pending from residents and we checked to make sure we would be addressing all of the outstanding requests with this policy.

Eric Wood stated he'd like to check the list of outstanding requests from residents at the next meeting to compare those with the draft policy. Steve responded he would have the framework set up at the next meeting to review.

Item will be continued to the next month's meeting.

## **6. REPORT OF COMMISSIONS, BOARDS AND COMMITTEES**

Doris Maez, Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee representative, was not present to give an update.

## **7. COMMENTS FROM COMMITTEE MEMBERS**

None

## **8. COMMENTS FROM STAFF**

Steve Davis stated the City has initiated recruitment for an engineer with traffic engineering experience to assist with traffic issues.

## **9. ADJOURNMENT**

Motion: To adjourn the Traffic Safety and Parking Committee (TSPC) meeting until it's next regular scheduled meeting on November 4, 2009 at 7 p.m.

(M/Howard, S/Weiner): 4-0-0 - Approved. Meeting Adjourned, 9:00 pm.